SOME NEW BOOKS.

British Foreign Policy.

We have lately received two important contributions to the history of the attitude of England toward foreign countries. We shall recur at length hereafter to one of these, an historical essay on "The Growth of British Policy," by the late Sir J. R. Seeley, which covers the period from the accession of Elizabeth to the death of William III. The other book to which, for the moment, we would draw attention is *The History of the Foreign Policy of Great Britain*, by Capt. MONTAGUE BURROWS, R. N., Professor of Modern History at Oxford (Putnams), which undertakes to review the whole epoch from the reign of Elizabeth down to the present day. The main purpose of this work is to show the continuity or continuous development of British foreign policy. Now and again, temporarily distorted or even reversed by dynastic interests, by careless diplomacy, by erratic statesmanship, by ecclesiastical dissensions, by foreign rivalry, or by stress of circumstances, it has, in Capt. Burrows's opinion, always reverted to the course prescribed by nature and approved by experience. This book was written to prove that, deeply implicated as England has become at certain times in the balance of power in Europe, yet she has never long lost sight of her unique position as an extra-Continental power, a position which, as her navy, her commerce, and her colonies grew, was destined to expand into that of a world-wide maritime empire. The delineation of the evolution, oscillation, and reconciliation of these two principles of national policy is the aim kept in view throughout the 350 pages of the book before us.

In the present notice we shall confine ourselves to a question of present and urgent interest, to wit, what is said by this semi-official expounder of England's foreign policy concerning her attitude toward the United States during the last hundred years. We regret that we are unable to regard all that is set down on this subject as entirely in accordance with the facts.

I.

In the sixth chapter of this volume the author outlines very briefly the relation of the thirteen American colonies to the mother country during the Seven Years' War. Yet, even here, he cannot restrain himself from injecting his personal views, which are those of an imperial federationist. He says, correctly enough, that the defence of their plantations in America formed the chief ground of the Seven Years' War so far as the British were concerned. The invasion of England herself, however, was soon to exhibit itself as a feature of the enemy's general project of attack, and thus every branch of Great Britain's foreign policy was brought to the test. It is this undoubtedly which makes the Seven Years' War so important a crisis in history; important enough on the Continent, but much more so to Great Britain. All that had been previously cherished as vital to the well being and even the existence of the nation, was in extreme danger, and its triumphant emergence from a sea of troubles as the war went on, fixed the circle of its future policy. Stress is very properly laid upon the fact that the idea of leaving the colonies to their fate can scarcely be said, at this epoch, to have entered the British mind. As Capt. Burrows puts it, the American colonies had grown up like children around their parents, although to the retrospective glance of Americans at the navigations acts and the regulations for stifling colonial manufactures, England appears rather as a stepmother than as a mother. It is true, however that the colonies were integral parts of the British Isles, with institutions in nearly all respects similar to those of the mother country. It is true, also, that, as yet, the colonists, considered as a whole, had not regarded England in any other light than as their mother country. The idea of separation had not yet been entertained, and could not be so long as the English settlements were threatened by the French from their coign of vantage in Canada. Up to the Peace of Paris it had naturally been deemed indispensable that there should be a firm link between the colonies and the Crown, in order not only that foreign aggression might be curbed, but also that fixed boundaries between themselves should be formed and preserved, and that order should be maintained during the period of social evolution, especially as the colonies had no unity and little mutual intercourse, being kept apart by intense jealousies, arising out of their different origins and constitutions. Without army or navy, and separated as they were by great distances, how could it be otherwise? So far no objection can be taken to Capt. Burrows's statement, but the comments which immediately follow are open to some criticism. It is remarkable, he thinks, that some writers should have blamed the mother country for not allowing them to run alone as soon as they were fairly settled. That comes, he adds, from "not understanding the age, or, perhaps, from transferring the ideas of a small party of modern political economists, now almost extinct, to the society which existed in the middle of the last century." We observe, in the first place, that the party of political economists to which Capt. Burrows thus slightingly refers is neither almost extinct nor small. Its views are not advocated by Mr. Goldwin Smith alone, but they were strikingly embodied in the despatch sent in June, 1895, by the Colonial Secretary, Lord Ripon, to the Governor-General of Canada, a despatch which practically put an end to the dream of imperial federation by declaring that the mother country would neither give a preferential treatment to colonial products in the home market, nor smooth the way, by a denouncement of the treaties with Belgium and Germany, for a preferential treatment of British products in colonial markets. As for leaving the colonies to run alone, it seems certain in the retrospect that in 1756 they could have defended themselves against France, since they were able to achieve their independence against the whole power of Great Britain, applied from Canada as a basis. It was, indeed, a wise man who wrote the pamphlet attributed at the time to Burke, and published in London just before the Peace of Paris, in which England was advised to accept from France the island of Guadaloupe in lieu of Canada and to leave the French and the Americans to fight it out between themselves. Had that been done, a little timely aid furnished by England to the independent colonists, struggling against French aggression, would have placed them under an inextinguishable debt of gratitude.

II.

When he comes to consider the Revolutionary war, as he does in his seventh chapter, the author evidently means to be fair, yet he is not wholly satisfactory. He begins by asserting that, up to the rupture with the colonies which George Grenville had set on foot by ill-judged fiscal measures, the leading aim of England's foreign policy had been to protect and develop the American colonies. Unquestionably, as we have said, the main motive for England's entering upon the Seven Years' War had been to protect the colonies. But she had never tried to develop them in the line of their own interests and wishes. In her navigation acts, and in all her legislation regarding colonial industries she had kept a single eye to the multiplication of consumers of her own products. To such an extent had this suffocating legislation been carried that the colonies would undoubtedly have revolted long before they did, but for the counter pressure exercised by the French in Canada. The author of the pamphlet above referred to perceived this truth distinctly when he said that, if England expelled the French from Canada, the colonists would speedily revolt. The same truth is recognized in some measure by Capt. Burrows when he says that in 1765, and afterwards, the ideas of the colonists underwent a great change, owing partly to the fact that there was no longer any hostile pressure upon them from France and Spain, and partly because they had taken offence at the neglect and blunders of the home Government. "These," he continues, "were the underlying elements of discontent, the former discreditable in the abstract to the colonies, but incidental to human nature; the latter equally discreditable to the mother country, but incidental to the low political standards of government, which was due to the long and unbalanced tenure of office by the Whig families." What follows is sufficiently obvious: "If any one could have foreseen that a war for independence would arise out of these elements of ill will which interpenetrated one another, a very slight attention to the wishes of the colonists would probably have prevented or at least deferred the disruption; but the neglect on the part of the British, so far as it did not proceed from mere carelessness, must be considered as the outcome of the insular feeling that enough had been done in the Seven Years' War for their children of the New World. It was thought that the time had arrived when they might fairly be called upon to pay a part of the interest of the British national debt, or, in other words, some portion of the immense expenses which had been incurred in their behalf."

It is indeed difficult, now that more than a century has passed away, to place ourselves in the situation of Englishmen during the eventful decade which preceded the American Revolution. The right to deal with the colonies as if they were a part of the national territory had in England not yet been practically disputed. Even the seditious "Junius" maintained the right to tax, while Burke declined to deny it, and declared: "The constitutional superiority of Great Britain should be as necessary for America as for ourselves, and consistent with all the liberties a sober and spirited American ought to require." So difficult was it to impress the mother country with the notion that there was a real danger ahead, that even the good-natured young King and his easy-going Minister, Lord North, when the obnoxious taxes had been repealed, thought there could be no harm in helping the East India Company by imposing on the colonists a slight tax on imported tea. Then came, though not without due warning, the unappeasable resistance, the burst of pent-up, furious passion on both sides, the blunders and confusions, the horrors of civil war, and the ultimate failure of Great Britain, assailed as she was on all sides. France and Spain fondly believed that the moment of their revenge had come, and even Holland remembered that she was once the sea rival of England. The assistance of the European enemies of Great Britain did, indeed, enable the otherwise overmatched colonies to hold their own; and the power of the British Government was almost paralyzed by the sustained opposition of great British statesmen, who did not scruple to take advantage, in Parliament and out of it, of the crisis at which their country had arrived. The surrender of Cornwallis, through no fault of his own, and the failures of English Admirals by sea on the American coast, at last convinced even the King, that the United States, led by Washington, had conquered their independence. It became plain that the separation of the two countries by the Atlantic was even in those days the controlling feature of the situation.

Capt. Burrows thinks that he can place himself where Englishmen stood a hundred years ago, and, at the same time, give the revolted colonists their due meed of praise. He admits that "they acted as Englishmen might be expected to act. They had carried with them the old English spirit, the old English education in freedom; they rose against what they thought to be tyranny; they learnt with marvellous rapidity the elementary arts of war from the troops sent to reduce them; they established a well-balanced republic, a model for others and a realization of their own political needs. The United States have expanded to an extent which no one could even have imagined in dreams, and spread British institutions over no small portion of the world's surface." When the author adds, however, that "both parties learned in the very act of separation to respect one another," he overstates the fact. The colonists, become independent, did not lose their respect for the mother country, and even felt a strong attraction toward it; the negotiation of the Jay treaty is a conclusive proof. But the English at that time evinced no respect for the Americans, nor did they later in the years that preceded the war of 1812, nor even later, until the more than Roman magnitude of our civil war compelled them to recognize that, on land, at least, the son was greater than the sire.

III.

Let us see what Capt. Burrows has to say about the war of 1812. He describes it as "the inevitable outcome of the British policy with respect to neutrals, maintained with dogged resolution, without heed to the consequences, as the only means of dealing with Napoleon's continental system." He seizes with avidity the chance to quote an admission of Capt. Mahan that England's policy toward neutrals, including the United States, was, at the crisis in question, necessary not only for her predominance at sea, but for her self-preservation. In Pitt's resolve to make Great Britain the "storehouse" of the world's commerce, Capt. Mahan recognizes a "great conception," radically sound, and, in the end, victorious; for the reason that "upon Great Britain and upon commerce hung the destinies of the world." But Capt. Burrows is candid enough to acknowledge that Capt. Mahan is here depicting the British policy from the British point of view, and that he goes on to blame the Government of the United States for having too tamely submitted to indignities, and regards the war of 1812 as justified.

Our author's own view of that war is this: That "the patience of the great transatlantic people had been too long and too severely taxed, and that such sympathy as there had been with the British cause was gradually submerged under the stress of British aggression." He asserts, on the other hand, that "the British Government, having no further employment for such great numbers of sailors as were required before the battle of Trafalgar, looked with aversion upon the employment of these trained seamen by the States and the evasion of the British laws as to neutrals." So they relaxed in no wise their efforts to search for them in neutral ships and to detain them as prisoners. Capt. Burrows admits that some of the men thus arrested had originally been Americans pressed into the British service in England or the colonies, who had gladly and rightfully reverted to their original status. Another fact passed over by many British historians of the war of 1812 is recognized by the author of this book, namely, that the idea that the States might suddenly turn into a naval power and dispute British predominance as the master of the seas had not once crossed the minds of the British, who were totally unprepared for the emergency of war with the American republic. It is pointed out that the English Admirals were absolutely unaware that the American navy, though extremely small, had been sagaciously supplied with a few ships "capable of meeting the British frigates on their shores with a greatly superior force." This, of course, refers solely to the superior weight of the armament carried by the American frigates. It is true, however, that the British Government, fully occupied at the moment with the Peninsular war and with Napoleon's invasion of Russia, could not bring themselves to believe that the Americans were in earnest. The fact is, of course, indisputable that five days after the American declaration of war, and some time after it reached England, the Government did what Capt. Burrows admits ought to have been done long previously, that is to say, it suspended the Orders in Council as regarded the United States. It was too late. The American war party had been growing in strength, and was by no means conciliated by so tardy a proceeding, and thus began what Capt. Burrows is pleased to describe as a war of brothers, though it is hard to detect any trace of fraternity in the vandalism of the British captors of Washington. We are glad to see the author of this book acknowledge, however, that the people of the States gained as much fame or more by their defence of New Orleans against the veterans of the Peninsula as they lost to the captors of their capital.

The only allusion to the relations of England to the United States during our civil war is confined to a few lines. Capt. Burrows says that, during this contest, "the temper of the British people was sorely tried by the serious difficulties which could not but affect them. The Trent affair fell like a fiery spark upon inflammable matter; but Palmerston's prompt action, accompanied by a conciliatory treatment of the question in which the Queen and the Prince Consort took a beneficent part, brought out the good sense and statesmanship of both Governments. War was happily averted, and the hard-won triumph of the Northern States renewed the cordial relations of the kindred on either side of the Atlantic." This is a most imperfect recital of the facts. It is well known that nothing but the submission of the Alabama claims to arbitration prevented a war between the United States and Great Britain, and that the relations of the two powers have since been anything but cordial, notwithstanding the effusive attempts of some official and many officious persons to assert the contrary.

M. W. H.

Prof. Shaler on Domestic Animals.

We are indebted to Mr. NATHANIEL SOUTHGATE SHALER, the well-known Professor of Geology in Harvard University, for an interesting and suggestive book on *The Relation of Domesticated Animals to Man and to His Advancement in Civilization* (Scribners). Of the papers collected in this volume, some originally appeared in *Scribner's Magazine*, but, to these, numerous additions have been made, and the two final chapters are entirely new. The most remarkable feature of this work is the endeavor to demonstrate that, of all the influences which have been exercised on man owing to the care required by his flocks, herds, and droves, perhaps the most important is that which has arisen from the broader development of his sympathies. In the development of the altruistic motives which, in the savage, are almost wholly lacking, the contact with dependent species of animals and the interest taken in them have, no doubt, been singularly effective. It is pointed out that the peoples which have attained the first upward step through the association with domesticated animals, are in their quality, so far as this is revealed by literature and history, much above the status of savagery. With the care of flocks are found connected the rudiments of poetry, the first notes of higher religious impulses, and a largeness of sympathetic life which is favored by the nature of the prevailing occupation. Where the nomadic habits of the original shepherds passed into the more sedentary customs of the soil tillers a further development of personal care and a consequent education of sympathies were inaugurated. Men had now to look after half a dozen or more kinds of animals; they had to learn their ways, and, in a manner, to put themselves in their places and conceive their needs. The life of a farmer is a continual lesson in fellow feeling, with the result that there is no class of the community from which the brutal instincts of the ancient savage life have been so completely eradicated. Prof. Shaler contrasts the liability of people bred in cities to behave, under circumstances of excitement, like savages, with the relatively sane and humane behavior of their kinsmen from the fields, and detects an essential difference of character which, in his judgment, cannot be explained, except by the diverse nature of the training which has been received. In a word, the purpose of this volume is to show that the process of the domestication of animals has a far-reaching aspect, a dignity, one may almost say a grandeur, that few human actions possess. If such a view of our relations to domestic animals were generally entertained, it would awaken men to a deeper sense of their duty toward the creatures which have been uplifted from their ancient natural state into the social order.

Not only all the domesticated animals, but all the domesticated birds, and also all the useful insects, are discussed at more or less length in this book. But one turns with especial curiosity to what the author has to say about the dog, the horse, and the elephant, and it is the chapters dealing with this subject upon which we shall principally dwell.

I.

Some naturalists have been disposed to hold that the dog is a descendant of the wolf, the whelps of which species, it is assumed, were captured by primitive men and brought under domestication. The objection to this theory is that, even with the high measure of attention which the conditions of civilization permit us to devote to the effort, it has been found impossible to educate captive wolves to the point where they show any affection for their masters, or are in the least degree useful in the arts of the household or the occupations of the chase. Other students of the problem have sought the origin of the dog in the hypothetical admixture of the blood of two or more different species, the wolf and the jackal being supposed to be the principal or the only components of the hybrid stock. Here, too, facts are against the supposition. No one has ever succeeded in hybridizing the wolf and the jackal, nor do our dogs show any more tendency to revert to the jackal than to the wolf. Prof. Shaler's own opinion is that our races of dogs have been derived from one or more original species of truly canine ancestors, the wild forms of which have long since disappeared from the earth. There is nothing strange in such a disappearance, when we bear in mind that the dog, the world over, was the first creature which man won to domesticity.

The author deems it likely that for ages the principal use of the dogs which dwelt about the camps of primitive folk was the reserve food supply which they afforded their thriftless masters. When the hunting was successful, the poor brutes would have a chance to wax fat but, when their masters were brought to a state of famine, they were doubtless accustomed, as are many savages at the present time, to eat a portion of their pack. In the early conditions of humanity there was no other beast which could be made to serve this oft-recurring need so well. The dog is, in fact, the only animal ever domesticated which can be trusted through his own affections alone to abide with his master amid the endless changes of camp and the rapid movements of flight and of the chase, which characterized men before they began to have settled habitations. The author suggests that the use of dogs for food may have in a certain curious way served greatly to advance the development of these captives. When the savage was driven to feed upon his dogs he would naturally be more willing to sacrifice the least intelligent and affectionate of them, delaying to the point of extremity the time when he would kill those which had endeared themselves to him. In this way for ages an effective, though unintended, process of selection was applied to these creatures, and to it many naturalists have attributed a large part of the intellectual, one may even say moral, elevation to which they have universally attained.

When the savage status of mankind with which the dog was at first made connected as the most intimate companion of man, was ameliorated and approached civilization, a number of special uses were found for the peculiar capacities of the animal. These, of course, varied in different parts of the world, according to peculiarities in the conditions of the masters. In high latitudes, where the ground was covered with snow in the winter season, dogs were used, as they are to this day, in hauling sleds. They were, perhaps, the first animals which were harnessed to vehicles. When they were brought to serve this definite end, one may well believe that the stronger and more enduring individuals would be spared in times of dearth, for the reason that they were almost indispensable to their masters, and even the little forethought which is observed among primitive peoples would lead to their preservation. Here came in the process of unintended selection which has made the Esquimau sled dog one of the most notable varieties of his kind. Another striking variation was induced at an early day among dogs through the pastoral habit. The custom of keeping sheep in large flocks is of extreme antiquity, far older, probably, than the pyramids of Egypt. The custom, however, could hardly have been instituted without the help of the sheep dogs. In form the creatures of this breed are believed to be very near to the original wild species whence all our canines came, but the variety has, as regards its instincts, been led by a process of education and selection far away from the original stock. Undoubtedly the wild forefathers of the canine species were natural-born sheep slayers, and the ovicidal impulse abides to this day in all the breeds which have strength enough to assail our unresisting flocks. So ingrained is the disposition in even the most civilized of our house dogs, which may, for generations, never have tasted blood, and show no inclination to attack the other animals of the barnyard, that they cannot be trusted alone with sheep. Especially is it true that, when two or more of them are together, the old instincts of the wild pack seem to return, and they will slay with insensate brutality until they are fairly exhausted with their fury. In the shepherd dog, on the contrary, we find this ancestral motive, which once constituted a large part of the creature's life, so overcome by education and selection that not only will he care for a flock with all the devotion which self-interest could lead the master to exhibit, but he will cheerfully undergo almost any measure of privation in order to protect his charges from harm. The annals of shepherd districts, especially those where winter snows are deep, abound in well-attested anecdotes which show how profoundly the dogs which tend the flocks are imbued with love for the animals committed to their care. This affection on their part is the more curious for the reason that it is never, in any measure, returned by the sheep. To them the canine custodian is ever a dreaded overseer. To the sheep he seems to suggest nothing but the memories of danger derived from the experience which the ovine species acquired in far-away times.

II.

The turnspit and the bulldog are the two other remarkable variations of the canine stock, which were brought about by a process of training and selection unconsciously directed to the evolution of breeds suited to special economic ends. The turnspit was bred for its short legs, and small, compact body, and was serviceable in those treadmills of the hearth which have long since passed out of use, but which were for centuries features of the kitchen. The massive type of bulldog, characterized by a heavy frame and an indomitable will, appears to have been evolved by a process of selection having for its unconscious end the development of a breed which should render to the herdsmen of horned cattle something like the assistance which the shepherd dog gave to those who had charge of flocks. Bulls and cows were formerly much wilder than at present, and were generally kept not in enclosed pastures, but on unfenced ranges. Under such conditions, the help afforded our ancestors by the modern bulldog was indispensable. The tasks, however, which the animal was called on to perform were of a ruder nature than those which were allotted to the shepherd dog. The business of bulldogs was to conquer comparatively large and unruly beasts. They were taught to seize the muzzle, and, by the pain they thus inflicted, they could subdue even the fiercest small bulls of the earlier breeds of cattle. Outside of the three varieties thus named, the divers kinds of dogs have been evolved mainly for purposes of amusement or for the indulgence of mere fancy. For example, the several sorts of hounds, harriers, beagles, pointers, setters, terriers, &c., have been designed to meet a dozen or more changes in the conditions of the chase. So long as our dogs were employed in the labors or organized recreations of man, the tendency of the association with the superior being was, in a high measure, educative. They were constantly submitted to a more or less critical and always effective selection, which constantly tended to develop a higher grade of intelligence. Now, on the other hand, with the advance in the organization of society, the dog is losing some of his utility, even in the way of sport. He is fast becoming a mere idle favorite, prized for mere unimportant peculiarities of form. The effort in the main is now not to make creatures which can help in the employments of man, but to breed for show alone, demanding no more intelligence than is necessary to make the animal a well-behaved denizen of the house. The result is the institution of a wonderful variety in the size, shape, and special peculiarities of different breeds, with, at the same time, what appears to be a concomitant loss in their intelligence. Prof. Shaler reminds us of the remark, often heard from those who are familiar with dogs, that the ordinary mongrels are more intelligent and more susceptible of high mental training than the carefully inbred varieties, which are more prized simply because they conform to some artificial standard of form or color. This, according to our author, is what we should expect from all that is known concerning the principles of modern dog breeding. To his mind, our treatment of this noble animal, where he is bred exclusively for ornament, is, in effect, degrading.

Reviewing some of the salient mental qualities of the canine species, Prof. Shaler expresses the opinion that in no wise do dogs exhibit human characteristics more distinctly than in the way in which they meet different individuals of the human race. The gamut of their social relations with men runs almost exactly parallel with our own. For instance, with from one to a dozen persons a dog may maintain an attitude of almost equally complete sympathy and mutual understanding. Then, again, he may be on terms of acquaintanceship, in varied degrees of familiarity, with a few score others with whom he comes in frequent contact. Toward the rest of mankind he maintains an attitude of more or less distrust, which, with experience, may attain the indifference that men commonly show toward perfect strangers. If one observes a dog going along a much frequented street, one cannot help noting that his demeanor toward the people met is substantially that which human beings show toward one another. He evinces, as they do, a certain consideration for the individuals he encounters, giving them their due place, yet holding to his own. It is particularly noticeable that he avoids all contact with the passers by. In fact, a dog has to be much beside himself with rage or fear before he will break those bounds of personality, which civilization has set up to guide the conduct of mankind. It may even be asserted that the social culture of dogs has reached the point where they recognize the meaning of an introduction and the resultant duties. Almost any well-bred dog will submit to be presented by his master, or even by persons whom he knows but is not accustomed to obey, to a stranger to whom he may have previously exhibited some dislike. During the introduction he will submit to those formal interchanges of courtesy which he is accustomed to acknowledge as the indices of friendship. The impression of this understanding seems to be so permanent that, on subsequent meetings, the dog, though he may have retained his original dislike of the man who has been forced upon his acquaintance, will continue to treat him with a certain consideration, though it is often easy in such cases to see that it is a difficult matter for the dog to conform to the requirements of society. Another extremely human characteristic observed in the canine species is their susceptibility to ridicule. Not even among men, except in the more sensitive natures, is contempt, expressed in laughter of the kind which conveys that emotion, so keenly and painfully appreciated. With certain breeds of hounds it is possible, by laughing in their faces, not only to quell their rage, but to drive them to a distance. They seem, in a way, to be put to shame, and, at the same time, hopelessly puzzled as to the nature of their predicament. In connection with this phenomenon is pointed out the very human feature that after you have cowed a dog by insistent laughter, you can never succeed in making friends with him. Prof. Shaler directs attention to another remarkable and hitherto unrecognized likeness between the mind of dogs and that of man: the fact, namely, that these dumb beasts, unlike all other inferior animals, except, perhaps, some of the more intelligent species of monkeys, will learn lessons from isolated experiences. From this point of view their aptitudes are equal to those of the lower kinds of men. Thus a dog who has had one unsavory or unfavorable experience with a skunk or porcupine is apt to keep away from these creatures for a long time thereafter. Where, again, a cur takes to eating eggs, a dose of tartar emetic, placed in an egg where he can find it, is likely to effect an immediate and complete reform.

In the long catalogue of human qualities which characterize thoroughly domesticated dogs, one should not overlook their sense of property. Herein this creature differs from all other domestic animals. It is, indeed, a common trait of mammals, both in their wild and tame state, that they evince a conception of ownership in the food which they have captured, or in the den which they have made their lair; but beyond these narrow, personal limits they afford as a rule no evidence of any comprehension of ownership in land or effects. On the other hand, our household dogs not only know the chattels of their master, and distinguish them from those of other people, but they also learn to recognize the bounds of their house lot, or even of a considerable farm. When a dog, even of a militant quality, enters on territory which he knows does not belong to him, his demeanor becomes at once different from that which he exhibits when he is on his own land. He treads warily, and will accept without dispute an order to take himself off. Prof. Shaler holds that a perception of this sort indicates an extraordinary amount of sympathy and discernment; implies that the dog has a good sense of topography, and that he observes closely the various acts, none of them, perhaps, very indicative, which go to show the limits of his master's claim. Here we may observe that the difference in respect of affection for locality on the part of cats and dogs is accounted for, in this book, by an original and essential variation in the habits of life of their wild ancestors. Judging by the kindred of the species which are known to us in their wild state, the author infers that dogs were, of old, accustomed to range over a wild field, having no fixed place of abode, the pack moving as the occasion arose for hundreds of miles in any direction. With cats, on the other hand, it is characteristic of the wild species that they have lairs to which they resort, and a definite hunting ground in which they seek their food. They are, in a word, animals of fixed routine, and as there has been no effort by breeding to change this feature, it has remained in its ingrained intensity.

III.

From the viewpoint of the student of domesticated animals, the author would go so far as to say that the races of men may be divided into those which have, and those which have not had the use of the horse. The largest economic problem primitive people, on their way upward toward civilization, had unconsciously to face, was that of obtaining some kind of force which could be added to the power of their own weak limbs. In the first step onward, as in almost all the succeeding steps, the advance depended on securing more energy than that with which mankind was naturally endowed. Although there are half a score of other animals which have done much for man, and which, indeed, have stamped themselves upon his history, no other creature has been so inseparably associated as has the horse with the great triumphs of our kind, whether won on the battlefield or in the arts of peace. It is true that, so far as material comfort or even wealth is concerned, the inhabitants of the northern temperate zone in the present age could perhaps better spare the horse from our present conditions of existence than either sheep or horned cattle; but, without this creature, it is certain that our civilization would never have developed in anything like its present form. It is doubtful whether, even now, it could be maintained at the existing level in the absence of the help rendered by the horse. There is one great occupation which we cannot conceive of as carried on without the services of horses. This, of course, is war. Whatever functions may ultimately be discharged by bicycles under peculiar conditions, no ordnance corps can do its appointed work in the rear of a line of battle without sending its wagons across country and over grounds which no unhorsed vehicle could travel. Except for the uses of war, however, it is possible that, in another century, the horse may be relegated to the position of a luxury and an ornament.

The interesting fact is dwelt upon by Prof. Shaler that the adaptation of the horse to man's uses was long arrested by the difficulty of protecting his hoofs on stony ground. We see the Greeks in classic times wrestling with this problem. The Romans found their paved roads peculiarly damaging to the feet of their horses. Both the classical peoples showed, in their ways of dealing with the difficulty, that lack of inventive skill which, as our author notes, so curiously separates ancient from modern men. They devised bags and soles of leather as coverings for the horses' feet, but none of these contrivances could have rendered service for any length of time. It was not, apparently, until about the fourth century of our era, when the Roman Emperors of the East began to employ barbarian cavalry, that the iron horseshoe was invented. The shoe first bore the name of "selene," from its likeness to the crescent shape of the new moon. Simple as it was, the horseshoe was a most important invention, for it completely accommodated the animal to the conditions of our higher civilization by removing the one hindrance to his general use in the work of war and commerce. Prof. Shaler deems it probable that with this invention began the great task of differentiating the several breeds of European horses for adaptation to various employments, as draught animals for packing purposes, as light saddle horses, and as horses built for bearing armored men. Neither the draught horses nor the war horses of mediæval Europe could well have been specialized, until their heavy bodies had been separated from the ground by metallic coverings of their hoofs.

It is another fact worthy of attention that the horse demands for his best nurture and keeping an amount of care demanded by no other animal which has been won to the uses of man, unless it be the silkworm. To be maintained in the best state, a horse has to be sedulously groomed. To bring him to the very best condition, some hours of human labor must each day be applied to keeping the skin of the animal in order. Prof. Shaler points out that the effect produced by friction on the horse's hide is not confined to the beauty that comes from cleanliness, but reacts upon the general nervous tone of the animal. There is no doubt, he thinks, that much grooming distinctly increases the elasticity and endurance of a horse's body. The influence of the grooming process is compared with that exercised by massage in the training of an athlete. The effect of this process may even be observed on some very old horse of good blood which for years has been allowed to go uncared for as an idle tenant of the pasture. Two or three days of assiduous grooming will bring back strength and suppleness to the aged limbs and restore something of the olden spirit.

In the opinion of the author of this book it is doubtful whether any of the horses possessed by the Greeks and Romans attained a weight much exceeding a thousand pounds. The first considerable departure in point of size from the original type seems to have been brought about when it became necessary to provide a creature which could serve as a mount for the heavy armored knights of the middle ages, when man and horse were weighted with from one to two hundred pounds of metal. To serve this need, it was necessary to have a saddle animal of unusual strength, weighing about three-quarters of a ton, easily controllable, and, at the same time, fairly speedy and nimble. To meet this requirement, the Norman horse was gradually evolved. The breed has, with slight modifications, survived, and is extensively used for draught purposes where strength is demanded at the sacrifice of speed. It is a curious fact that the creatures which now draw the beer wagons of London are the nearest living representatives of the horses which bore the mediæval knights. The change of function may seem ignoble, but we may be grateful for any accident which has preserved to us, though in a somewhat degraded form, the noblest product of the breeder's art, which, quite as much as the valor of our ancestors, won success for the Teutonic folk in their great struggle against Islam. The best of our present artillery horses, particularly those placed next the wheels, are generally in part Normans.

Prof. Shaler does not share the opinion current among those who do not know the animal well, that the horse is endowed with much sagacity. Undoubtedly the creature has the faculty of quick observation and a retentive memory. From the viewpoint of rationality, however, the mind of the horse, compared with that of the dog or of the elephant, is pronounced very feeble. The emotional side of the equine nature seems little more developed than the rational. Although horses have a certain affection for the hand that feeds them, and, in a mild way, are disposed to form friendships with other animals, they are not, in Prof. Shaler's opinion, really affectionate, and never, so far as he has been able to learn, show any distinct signs of grief at separation from their masters or of pleasure when they return to them. There are, indeed, many stories that appear to testify to a certain faithfulness on the part of horses which are said to have remained beside their fallen riders. But the author of this book does not regard the facts as justifying the inference that the actions described were due to such affection as the dog indisputably feels.

IV.

The relations of man to the elephant are more peculiar than those which have been formed with any other domesticated animal. They are indeed unique. Although the creature will breed in captivity, its reproduction in that state is exceptional, for the reason that many years of expensive nurture must elapse before the offspring are fit for any service. It is, indeed, about thirty years before the elephant is sufficiently adult to attain a good measure of strength and endurance. It has, therefore, been the habit of the people who avail themselves of this admirable beast, to use mainly the animals which they have made captive in the wilderness. It is a most interesting and exceptional fact that these captive elephants, though bred in perfect freedom and provided with none of those inherited instincts so essential to the value of other domesticated animals, become immediately helpful to man, and attached to him in a way which is characteristic of none other of our ancient companions, except the dog. Prof. Shaler does not hesitate to say that the Asiatic elephant is the most innately domesticable and the best fitted by nature for companionship with man of all our great quadrupeds. The qualities of mind which, in our other domesticated animals, have been slowly developed by thousands of years of selection and intercourse with human beings, are, in this creature, constituents of its wild estate. It appears from trustworthy anecdotes that the Asiatic elephants in the course of a few months of captivity acquire all the rules of conduct which it is necessary to impose upon them. The speediness and completeness of this intellectual subjugation may be judged by the fact that, after a short term of domestication, elephants will take a willing and intelligent part in capturing their kindred of the wilderness, showing in the prosecution of this function little or no disposition to rejoin the wild herd. In the case of no other animal can we find anything like such an immediate and loyal adhesion to the ways of civilization. We can only account for this extraordinary peculiarity of the elephant on the supposition which, on other grounds, appears to be thoroughly justified, that, even in its wild state, this creature represents a type of intelligence and instinct more nearly like those of men than is the case with any other wild mammal, an affinity with human qualities which is, perhaps, only approached by certain species of birds.

The American Indian.

A new collection of books relating to American history, to be called the "Story of the West Series," has been projected by the Appletons, and is to be edited by Mr. Ripley Hitchcock. The series begins attractively and usefully with the volume called *The Story of the Indians*, by GEORGE BIRD GRINNELL. This book is based on recollections of actual Indian life; it is obvious, indeed, that only an author qualified by personal experience could offer us a profitable study of a race so alien from our own as is the Indian in thought, feeling, and culture. Only long association with Indians can enable a white man measurably to comprehend their thoughts and enter into their feelings. Such association has been Mr. Grinnell's, and the conclusion to which it has brought him is that, while the red man is a savage, and consequently has savage qualities, yet the most striking characteristic of the Indian is his reproduction of the child period in the life of his white brother. In his simplicity, his vanity, his sensitiveness to ridicule, his thirst for revenge, and his fear of the supernatural, he is, all his life, a child, and acts like one. No attempt is made by the author of this volume to suggest to the Federal legislators a solution of the Indian problem. His aim is to place them at the intelligent and sympathetic point of view from which alone is attainable a solution worthy of a powerful, enlightened, and humane nation. We are to act; he is simply a narrator. He warns us, however, in his preface not to forget that the red men are human like ourselves; that they are fathers and mothers, husbands and wives, brothers and sisters; men and women with emotions and passions like our own, even though these feelings are not well regulated, and directed in the calm, smoothly flowing channels of civilized life. Not until more of us are brought to recognize this common humanity can we attain a right comprehension of the character of the Indian and deal with him as we ought to deal in legislation.

I.

In the course of nearly three hundred pages, the author depicts almost every phase of Indian life as it has come under his own observation, or as it is revealed in American history interpreted by the light of his experience. We see the red man at home or amid his recreations; we become familiar with his marriage relations, with his arrangements for subsistence, with his modes of hunting, and with his methods of making war. His implements and industries are made known to us, and so are his religious views, comprehending under that term the red man's conception of his relation to his fellow men, to nature, and to an overruling deity, and his notion of the circumstances under which he was created, and of his future state. The effect upon his mind and upon his situation of the coming of the white man is depicted in a separate chapter. We have only hearty commendation for the substance, the merit, and the spirit of this book, but we cannot here follow the author through his narrative, and must limit ourselves to an outline of the facts brought out in an appendix summing up the attributes of the natives of North America. We are there reminded that the Indians of this continent constitute a unique race, the physical characteristics of which are preserved with remarkable uniformity throughout all the tribes. Although the diverse conditions of life in various parts of a wide continent have caused differences of stature and color, and of social or political development in certain directions, these differences are of minor importance, and it may be truthfully said that the red men offer no such wide variation as is observable among the different groups of the white, yellow, and black races.

Yet, while an Indian is always an Indian, the fact is not to be lost sight of that every tribe has characteristics of its own. The popular notion that all Indians have the same speech and the same modes of life is, of course, altogether erroneous. In North America alone, and in the region north of Mexico, there were nearly sixty distinct linguistic stocks, which, so far as is now known, had no direct relation to each other, and represented groups of Indians apparently unconnected by ties of blood with any other family. In other words, these tribes, or groups of tribes, differed from each other in speech more widely than do the various European nations, for, except the aboriginal Basques and the intrusive Turks, Huns, &c., all the European nations constitute branches of a single linguistic trunk, the Indo-European, or Aryan. The difference between two Indian linguistic stocks such as the Algonquin and the Dakota is comparable, therefore, not with that between Greeks and Germans, but to that between the greater groups, Aryan and Semitic, or Aryan and Turanian. What is here said of the Algonquin and Dakota families is equally true of the Pawnee, Athabascan, and Iroquois. Another fact commonly unrecognized is noted by Mr. Grinnell. While some of the Indian linguistic families were made up of many tribes, collectively controlling a vast extent of territory and speaking different dialects, or even using languages as unintelligible to one another as is Russian to an Englishman, there were other families which consisted of a single small tribe, apparently possessing no affinities with any of its neighbors. We learn, for instance, that on the Pacific coast, where about two-thirds of the different linguistic stocks exist, one may find a little village of fishing Indians who, as they assert, have inhabited this same region from time immemorial, and who yet have nothing in common with their nearest neighbors, a few miles away, and are unable to communicate with them except by signs or by the so-called Chinook jargon, which has become the common trade language of the Northwest coast.

II.

As the Indian families—we have thus far used families in the philological sense—differed from each other in language, so the various tribes differed in culture. North of the Mexican boundary all tribes were practically in the stone age of development. The use of metals was unknown. In a few cases native copper was employed for ornaments or utensils, but it was treated as stone and hammered into shape. The red man's arms were wrought of stone, chipped, hammered, or ground from flint or some other hard rock. His clothing was made of skin. Many tribes manufactured pottery of a very simple kind, useful for dishes and cooking utensils. Their permanent dwellings were as varied as the regions which they inhabited, yet it may be said that, in their movable lodgings or tepees, which were made of skins or bark, one type prevailed over almost the whole continent. Again, while the subsistence of the people was largely dependent on hunting and fishing or derived from the wild fruits of the earth, yet a very large proportion of the tribes practised agriculture. Especially was this true of those which inhabited the country of abundant rainfalls lying between the Atlantic Ocean and the Mississippi River. Yet it was by no means confined to these alone, for many tribes upon the high, dry plains, of Pawnee, Dakota, and Algonquin stock, raised crops of corn, beans, and squashes. The tribes, indeed, of the extreme southwest depended for support very largely on agriculture, and they even practised irrigation. Another point to be considered in measuring the level of civilization reached is the fact that picture writings were used among all the tribes, although these methods of notation were, of course, carried to their greatest perfection among the families which had reached the highest grade of culture. Among the Nahuatl and Mayas of the South, and the Algonquins, and Iroquois of the North, picture writings on skin, bark, or cloth sometimes took the form of long, historical documents, or served to render permanent the ritual of important ceremonies. But even among the nomads of the plains, paintings on skins often commemorated the important events of the year, sometimes by months; while some of these chronicles ran back for years, and even, it is said, for a century. No one will dispute Mr. Grinnell's assertion that such writings, if not history, were at least records.

Another matter commonly misunderstood, but to which due attention is given by our author, is the social condition of the North Americans. It is a mistake to suppose that the place of woman among the red men was that of a slave or of a beast of burden. The existence of the gentile organization, and the fact that in most of the tribes descent in the female was alone recognized, forbade any such subjugation of women. In many tribes women took part in the councils of the peace; in some, women were even the tribal rulers; while in all they received a fair measure of respect and affection from those related to them. At a council held in 1791 with the Huron Iroquois the women spoke to the American Commissioners as follows: "You ought to listen to what we women shall say as well as to the sachems, for, behold, we are the owners of this land, and it is ours. It is we that plant it for our use and theirs. Hearken to us, therefore, for we speak of things that concern us and our children." It is further to be noted that among the Moquis and other Pueblos, and among the Navajoes, men and women worked together in the fields. By the Moquis the young unmarried women are not expected or allowed to perform such heavy work as carrying water up the mesa, and among the Navajoes a man may even cut out and sew a buckskin shirt. At the present moment the keeper of the tribal medicine of the Kiowas is a woman, and in the same tribe the grandmother practically rules the family, although she works as hard as the other women. Among the contemporary Cheyennes, also, the woman has great influence. The currency of the mistaken notion that among the red men women were slaves is attributed by Mr. Grinnell to the fact that their duties are such as civilized men commonly regard as toil, while the really more arduous pursuits, as hunting, and war, are looked upon by white men as amusements. In point of fact, among red men the labors of their savage existence were not unevenly divided between the sexes. In their home life the Indians were much like other people. The men, as a rule, were affectionate husbands and fathers, often undergoing severe sacrifices and privations for the sake of their family. Parents were devotedly attached to their children, and a strong feeling existed between the members of a family—we use the term here in a social sense—even though the tie of blood uniting them was remote.

III.

One more misconception of Indian character, which has obtained a firm footing in the popular mind, will be dispelled in the book before us. It is generally believed—and the belief was propagated by Cooper's novels—that the red men are grave, taciturn, and sullen in their ordinary life. Speaking from a prolonged personal experience, Mr. Grinnell bears testimony that this is far from being true. The truth is that they are fond of society, gossipy, great talkers, with a keen sense of humor, and great quickness of repartee. In their villages and their camps frequent visits were paid from lodge to lodge. In time of plenty feasts were continual, and social gatherings for dancing, story telling, or conversation occurred even more often than they do in civilized communities. Continually among young men, and not seldom among young women, were formed friendships which remind one of the attachment which existed between David and Jonathan, and such friendships frequently lasted through life, or were interrupted only by the assumption of family ties.

We come finally to the most important fact brought out by the author of the volume, that it is in their polities, or, at least, the systems of government devised by some of them, that the aboriginal Americans showed their greatest advance in culture. The so-called civilizations of the South, of Peru and Mexico, while much higher than those of tribes inhabiting the territory now comprised within the United States and Canada, yet differed from the latter in degree rather than in kind; and the league of the Iroquois, since it has been thoroughly understood, has challenged admiration both for its organization and its purpose. This was an offensive and defensive confederation, originally of five tribes, the Onondagas, Oneidas, Senecas, Cayugas, and Mohawks, formed by the Onondaga chief Hiawatha about the middle of the sixteenth century, and subsequently enlarged by the admission of the Tuscaroras. Of this system, Mr. Hale has said: "The system devised by Hiawatha was to be not a loose and transitory league, but a permanent confederate Government. While each nation was to retain its own council and the management of local affairs, the general control was to be lodged in a Federal Senate composed of representatives to be elected by each nation, holding office during good behavior, and acknowledged as ruling chiefs throughout the whole confederacy. Still more remarkable, the federation was not to be circumscribed to the original parties. It was to be indefinitely expansible. The avowed design of it was to abolish war altogether." Our author quotes with merited approval Dr. Brinton's comment on this astonishing achievement of the red men in the science of government: "Certainly, this scheme was one of the most far-sighted and, in its aim, beneficent which any statesman has ever designed for man." It was not, therefore, without good reason that Hiawatha was selected by the poet Longfellow as the eponym of his native American epic.